



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,205	11/09/2001	William Paul Harding-Jones	64645-1053	2260
27045	7590	08/24/2006		EXAMINER
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR C11 PLANO, TX 75024				BOUTAH, ALINA A
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2143

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/045,205	HARDING-JONES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alina N. Boutah	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed December 14, 2005. Claims 1-30 are pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hariguchi (USPN 6,181,698) in view of Ramasubramani (USPN 6,507,589).

Regarding claims 1, 9, 17 and 25, Hariguchi teaches a method for routing a message to a function instance comprising the steps of: receiving the message; requesting a destination address for the function instance from a local repository; whenever the destination address is local, sending the message to the function instance; and whenever the destination address is not found, requesting the destination address for the function instance from a remote repository, packaging the message with the requested destination address and sending the packaged message to the function instance (col. 1, lines 45-50, col. 2, lines 1-11; col. 9, lines 46-57, col. 13, lines 40-49).

However, Hariguchi fails to explicitly teach whenever the destination address is remote, packaging the message with the destination address and sending the packaged message to the function instance. Ramasubramani teaches this deficiency in abstract, figures 9 and 13. At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Hariguchi and Remasubramani in order to direct incoming messages to different parts of network devices, therefore allowing different ways in message processing (col. 2, line 63 to col. 3, line 2).

Regarding claims 2 and 10, Hariguchi teaches the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the step of sending the message to the function instance comprises the step of sending the message to a queue for delivery of the message to the function instance via a dispatcher (figure 8).

Regarding claims 3, 11, 19 and 27, Hariguchi teaches the method as recited in claim 1, further comprising the step of storing the requested destination address in the local repository whenever the destination address is not found (col. 1, lines 11-24).

Regarding claims 4, 12, 20 and 28, Hariguchi teaches the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the function instance includes a label and the destination address is requested using the label (col. 1, lines 11-24).

Regarding claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 21, 22, 29 and 30, Hariguchi teaches the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the local repository and the remote repository are look up tables (col. 1, lines 43-45).

Regarding claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23 and 24, Hariguchi teaches receiving a message remotely or locally is a user's choice (sender).

Regarding claims 18 and 26, Hariguchi teaches a queue communicably coupled to the messaging agent; a dispatcher communicably coupled to the queue; and the messaging agent sending the message to the function instance by sending the message to the queue for delivery of the message to the function instance via a dispatcher (figure 8, abstract).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to Applicant's argument that Hariguchi fails to teach the recited steps of first requesting a destination address from a local repository and then subsequently requesting the destination address from a remote repository as claimed, the PTO respectfully submits that this is being taught by Hariguchi in the cited areas above. "Repository" as defined by Applicant in the specification is simply a look up table (see Specification, page 16, line 15).

Col. 2, lines 1-11 of Hariguchi discloses using 2 routing tables to find routes. These tables are rt_host and rt_net tables. When a datagram is being decoded, the router tries to lookup a route in rt_host table. If a route is not found, it looks up a route in the rt_net table. In this case, rt_host table and rt_net tables are herein interpreted as local and remote repository, respectively as claimed.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alina N. Boutah whose telephone number is 571-272-3908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (9:00 am - 5:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ANB

ANB



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100